

ECO-EXTREMISTS



REFLECTIONS

Nº 4

For this 4th edition of "Eco-Extremist Reflections", we get into a more "philosophical" field to say it, including reflections and thoughts about different concepts such as freedom or morality. Then we turn to focus on some specific modern human attitudes, these being love, reasoning and a review of their actions in general terms. And finally we present the text "Autexousious Apanthropinization" by Archegonos, in this text delves into the nihilistic abyss that denies all ideology centered on the human and its progress.



Indice:

1. Reflections on freedom
2. Thoughts on morality
3. Weak words about the human reasoning
4. Some reflections on the acts of the modern human from an eco-extremists perspectives
5. Why should I love you? Brief night reflections on love
6. Autexousious Apanthropinization

Reflections on freedom

In this writing, I decide to explain in the clearest way, my view on freedom, as a concept, from an eco-extremist perspective. The reasons that persuade me to make this essay are quite varied, among them, it could consider the most important, the fact that I have observed how this very ambiguous concept, interferes in the discourses of a very high amount of individuals and groups, whose make apology of it, without ever arriving to a polished view of it. Because of that, I think, there is a fog of whom it can't never be answered, what is being sought, what is being wanted trying to achieve "freedom". I'm not interested in going into details on the definitions suggested by the dictionaries on this word, nor will I tackle in this essay the perspectives that a citizen could have on this concept, because, clearly, this isn't intended for them. This is intended for anyone who is searching a clearer and more realistic interpretation of the world that surrounds him, and I expresse this as a contribution to the debate, and not as a declaration.

Somebody would indicate that it is a negative concept, in which, one is not "free to" (positive interpretation), but "free of", "free of all authority", "free of oppression", "free of domination", etc. Meanwhile others, maybe smarter, or less confused than the first ones, would see this term in a positive way, "free to develop", "free to act", etc. An anarchist could say that he wants to achieve freedom, fighting in a war against the state and the authority, which restrict his free development and determination, while an anti-civilization could say that the only thing we can aspire to reach in this world is the individual freedom.

Here, none of them are being clear on what they want or what they really desire. In a world without state nor authority, the human, like all of the rest living creatures, would be dependent on an immense amount of factors that restrict his "free develop". While, inside of this reality in which we are submerged, it is simply impossible to reach the realization of such a vague concept as "individual freedom". You could throw yourself completely to live with the wild, to carve your spear, to sharpen your senses, to hunt and gather your own food, you could try it. Even assuming that you could reach such a feat, you wouldn't take long to see your environment invaded by machines, and by the lifeless grey of the civilization.

The first one could argue that the conditions of his environment in particular don't limit his "freedom", but rather they mold his reality in a certain way, but let's analyze this thoroughly.

One of the main reasons of why anarchists hate the state and authority, is because they deprive many of reaching the same opportunities as the rest. In a world in which there weren't this demoniacal entities, I actually see very difficult, if not impossible, to think in any scene that gave the same opportunities to everybody. A group of humans who lived in tropical environments, clearly would have advantage in fruit gathering, and in the access to a variety of them, while other group, in more austere environments, would be "forced" to resort to hunt or fishing more frequent. Conditions are IMPOSED, there isn't "freedom" in this, (later, the essay will go in depth on this issue). Another practical example could be the diet issue. A lot of anarchists, believe that they are in the coherence and ethic way, practicing the veganism, because they consider it in part as the exercise of their freedom, choosing certain way of diet, and at the same time, it is made in pursuit of the freedom of other individuals.

In wild nature, not a single animal can choose its diet, that depends on the environment. Civilization needs to capitalize every single one of our practices, if we fed ourselves only with the food that our environment offers us, it would be something very unprofitable, because of that, new and strange trends emerge continually, with infinite of diet proposals, so that we can choose the best one that fits with our (induced) "individual aspirations", for sure, for more than one it will be difficult to glimpse the illusion that is developed here, but let's think. We actually can't decide on our true vitally importance issues in this sense. We can't decide if we want to consume not-modified food, or free of toxic chemicals, or if we want to drink clean water. But of course, we can follow a "paleolithic" diet, we can choose to be vegans or to follow a raw diet. Is it really more valuable to have a lot of false choices (false in the sense that we couldn't naturally choose those options) than to be able to access to the only natural and true option?

Maybe, the second one, referring to individual freedom, could say that the only fact of determinate his own way, is enough to consider himself owner of a certain "freedom". It seems an interesting point for me, though very questionable too. Firstly because in this case, freedom would become something too abstract, since practically any individual that declares himself aware of his choices, could allege to be "free", this declaration doesn't stand up, when we contemplate the fact that we live in a civilized

environment. Day after day, we are exposed to a myriad of sensorial stimuli, that deeply affect our perception of reality. One could believe that he determines his own way, but it actually is your breeding and environment what moulded you to walk in this or that direction. Even the most “deconstructed” anarchist would feel obliged to admit how the schemes of civilization have left a mark on his being, if he doesn’t admit it, he is nothing but a fool. Of course, the eco-extremists, or at least speaking from me, I don’t have any problem in assuming myself as a modern and civilized human, deeply domesticated and very distant from my true animality, I’m not “free” at all. Even the eco-extremism, as Halputta Hadjo has already specified, is a product of its environment, an hostile, sick and artificial environment, an environment that pushes us unavoidably to the confrontation path, to those who listen the call of our instincts and our ancient roots.

Within civilization, I think that doesn’t have any sense to talk on “individual freedom”, we can’t even move freely in a strictly physical sense, no way in a mental sense. But even outside civilization, in a context in which I fall because of some cause, this type of concepts wouldn’t be practicable either. Not a single animal can move with total freedom, falcons can’t explore submarine caves, polar bears can’t live in tropical environments, there are ample examples. And regarding the mental sense, taking the issue to an abstract and maybe subjective level, at least in my opinion, it isn’t possible either, and I will base in an example to express this point more precisely. A bonobo born in a bonobo family, is accustomed since its birth to feed with fruits and insects, to live in a tropical environment and to have a highly active life. It is the only option that was given to it, it never knew anything different. It is possible that if it had tried another type of diet, its tastes or desires would be different, it is possible that if it had lived in colder lands, maybe it would like them, or maybe not, in the end, it will never be able to know it. I am going to use another example that could provide more clarity. Wolves lived thousands of years in a wild way, living in very varied environments. At some point, wolves began to approach humans, they laid down near the warmth of the fire, and tested the comfort of receiving food without having to hunt, a lot decided to stay. Little by little, they lost their savagery and became domestic animals. Here, each reader will have his opinion on the example. We could think that, the wolf’s resignation to its wild life, submitted it to the slavery of the domesticity. The truth is, that it doesn’t had freedom before choosing this decision, having a feisty, hard life, with many needs and making huge efforts to survive, under what point of view could we consider it as freedom? The wolf made a decision, between two options that were presented to it, it chose one, before than the other. I wouldn’t oppose much objection to the affirmation of some individual that maintained that this gave to the wolf the freedom that the wild life couldn’t offer to it.

Another point on the “freedom” phenomenon, of which I would like to make some assessments, is about the struggles for the supposed “animal and earth liberation”.

Firstly, taking out an animal from the physical cage in which it is, does it necessarily give it freedom? The options are limited, it is took to a “vegan sanctuary”, in which it will have a very limited terrain to circulate, where it will depend of the schedules ruled by humans to eat, and even sometimes to leave its enclosure or yard. Where (in the majority of cases), it will be forced to coexist with lots of animals in limited spaces, sometimes of very varied species, in a totally unnatural way. Being fed with industrial trash, and accessing to that trash in an artificial way, from the hands of some human. Anyone can realize that, if freedom existed, it would not be represented by the previous situation.

Another option to that “rescued” being, would be to abandon it in some chink of wild nature that still remain. That animal, who probably was uprooted from its natural environment at its firsts life moments, or who directly has born in an artificial environment, and doesn’t know at all the environment in which it should develop. It wouldn’t have the tools to live on its own, and to survive within wild nature. Most probably it wouldn’t be able to go through the first night with life. But even assuming that it would make it, wounds exerted on both body and mind, would leave totally unforgettable scars in its being. It could perhaps manage to survive some time, dealing with its environment, but as a domesticated being, with a deeply conditioning inculcated by its experience near humans. And beyond all of this, in the remote and illusory case in which that animal could forget completely all its memories and experiences from its captivity, heal its wounds and deny its domestication, it wouldn’t live in freedom within wild nature, because within wild nature, freedom has no validity, both practical and theoretically.

Now, refering to “earth liberation”, I don’t have so much to say. It seems to me an exaggeratedly illusory and leftist concept. Earth doesn’t need a group of humans to return its lost “freedom”, if it is bearing and hosting human trash at this ephemeral moment, it doesn’t mean that it won’t make humans feel the consequences. Humans sink themselves into tragedy, they have been disrespectful with the earth for too long, and it will be the earth itself, who will erase all civilized trace, if it will be soon or not, is something that doesn’t really matter to me. In addition, earth doesn’t need “freedom”, it needs just to be and to develop with its cycles and

processes like it has done it throughout history. And I ask myself, what would make the earth more free? The fall of civilization? The responsible use of the “resources”? The human extinction? I believe that many different people could have varied opinions on this, which shows, that this concept, apart from being fallacious and leftist, is extremely subjective, no serious analysis could develop based on this.

Arriving to the central point of this essay, I’m going to strain to explain why, in my perspective, freedom, understood in any of the previous exposed ways, doesn’t exist, and if it exists it would be opposed as concept and practice, to wild life.

As I said before, is your environment what mostly determines your way. Not a single animal, within a wild environment, has the possibility to decide how its life will be, nor where its life will pass. All of this conditions are imposed to us before the birth. It has been the civilized human, within its immense confusion, disguised as “reasoning” and “Intelligence”, the only animal who has transformed his life experience, so currently, he can opt for some particular “modus vivendi”, all justified by the abstract and harmful freedom concept. The human confusion, expresses its weakness in its highest point, in this sense. We have built an immense barrier between us and the natural world, most humans even fear everything that hides, drags, flies, creeps, swims or runs beyond the cement walls that demarcate their cities.

Hence, the insatiable search of the civilization for design the most comfortable cage, in which the individuals could be calm, and without doing to much scandal.

The failure is inevitable. You can’t just take a group of animals who lived in a way for thousands of years, throw them in a cage and wait that they develop in a healthy and full way. Nature already gave us our place in this game, and it isn’t the central place, it isn’t of vital importance for nothing nor anybody, it is just a piece within a great compendium of other pieces, as useful as dispensable. It is the place that we have, and it is because fits symbiotically with all that surround us, and it has adapted through centuries. It doesn’t matter how many scientists and techno-nerds do you have at your disposal, trying through the cold calculation and the rigid technique, monitoring the different attributes and qualities of the human, to be able to reproduce the healthier environment for them. It just doesn’t work like that. We need to walk barefoot, not ultra thin shoes that adapt floor contour, we need to have an active life, not good gyms for make exercises, we need to be in contact with the gods and spirits that inhabit everything that manifestss over earth, and all the logic of the world could never harmonize with that. Nature is everything that is by itself, like it has been said before, it doesn’t need a purpose, it doesn’t need to explain and DOESN’T need reasons. Our civilized mind tries to find explanations for everything, we try to be masters and lords of existence, ignoring that we are mere actors, playing our historic role, inside of the ephemeral and overestimated experience known as “life”, we won’t be more than a light that turned on for some seconds, sinking then into the eternal darkness of the infinite. We reject our role in this game, we bath in illusions and forget our truth. Eco-extremism, is just the belief in an order, or natural chaos, what you prefer, which we obey without any type of reproaches. All the animals know, since the moment of their birth, which is the way that they have to follow, it isn’t that “they don’t think about that”, “they act by instinct”, like a simple robot responding to computer commands, it influences the instinct, the contemplation of the environment too, the test through direct experience, the lesson of the oldest, among many other factors. At this point, it doesn’t really matter if monkeys have, or not, ability to construct buildings, they wouldn’t simply do such stupidity. Human constantly attempts agaisnt himself, deny his own nature and since the beginning of civilization, until today, it hasn’t been registered any intelligent, astute or minimally sensible human act. The fact to be able to do certain things, to have the capacity to execute them, doesn’t influence in any manner in the need or importance of those things. The lie of civilization has taken control of the weak minds of those animals that, captured and on the edge of extinction decided to pervert their environment and their nature to overwhelm. This lie get special importance in the minds of those who believe that they are against this tortuous reality. Who take the most “comfortabe” civilized values for them, and try to draw with them an experience that is as fictitious as the experience of which they allegedly deny.

They are horrified by the “barbaric” acts of the savages who lived in the past, but extol a false view of nature and the existence of the rest of the animals. It seems that at civilization, the “I take what I like, and I leave what I don’t like” logic, is a constant. Of course, it is comfortable and pleasant for anybody to think in the noble natives, who lived free of hierarchies and authority, in harmony with nature, but when we talk on the Selknam and his patriarchy, on the Calusa and his complex society with hierarchies, or on the tribes that pulled heads off or traded with women, more than one bend his look and seems that he doesn’t have any idea of what are we talking about, it is so painful for the secular anarcho-primitivists, to accept that their idealized primitive humans

worshipped gods. Who is not satisfied thinking about a life without paid work, walking calmly at meadows gathering blackberries. But wild life doesn't pass in that way.

We can't keep from emphasize on this point as concisely as possible and in an energetic way, freedom is an illusion, nature isn't our mother, it is "cruel", "ruthless", and yes, it is "oppressive", at least in the eyes of the hyper-civilized, because in our eyes it just is, it is like it is and how it has always been. We don't shudder when tectonic plates impact, nor when a tsunami makes dissappear some ecosystem, therefore, we neither shudder when a crocodile eats its youngs or when a tribe of wild humans choke their babies. We shake off the civilized prejudices, kill our moral being, accept the reality, see our truth to its eyes and DON'T feel fear.

Zúpay



Thoughts on morality

When researching the Creek War for my article in Atassa, a curious thing I encountered was the attitude that the Indians had towards black slaves. For the Creeks and Seminoles, a slave was not free by virtue of slavery being an immoral institution and thus illegitimate. A slave was no longer a slave once he decided to stop being a slave and run away. One of the issues that the whites had with these Indians was how they would harbor escaped slaves, and this was a major point of contention in the Second Seminole War. But this was not due to the “enlightened” attitude of the Indians. They were not above taking blacks as slaves themselves, or keeping them in bondage. The point was that the “freedom” and “dignity” imparted to all human beings by Enlightenment thinking was not a given for the uncivilized mind. It had to be “earned” or “seized” from those who would take it from them.

I have left behind the idea of noble sentiments, those transient feelings that merely wishing for nice things makes me a good person. I have seen to many instances wherein people believed in mercy only to commit atrocities, or committed atrocities as an act of mercy. It is best just to try to empty yourself of those sentiments: whatever happens will happen. Death comes soon enough, weariness brings forgetfulness, long-suffering numbness. The only victory comes in being still here and still standing.

People want their dignity and life recognized merely for existing. It doesn’t work that way. That is the leftist dream, but it never achieves anything. That we all mean something just because we are: we are joined to the noble savage and the future transhumanist explorer of the stars due to some continuity... Continuity! What a fabulous lie! All the savages are slaughtered, and by dancing on their graves... I mean, “honoring them,” we obtain the wisdom and power that they should still have but don’t. We think we are all the same but we aren’t. In fact, it’s that thinking we are all the same, that we are all “humanity”, that leads us to cut down the forest, pollute the rivers, till the land to depletion, and pave the rest. Because we’re humanity, because that’s “our” good. Humanity is the enemy of nature because it is the enemy of place, of physicality, of wildness. There are human beings (human animals), and then there is Glorious Humanity. If one does not stare humanity in the face and declare one’s opposition, one is either a fool or a coward.

To separate the human being / animal and Humanity is not so simple. In fact, it is nearly impossible. It is like asking the animals to stay away from the watering hole in the hot summer.

To posit indiscriminate and selective actions is to posit the superiority of the Inhuman over the human; that is, that human beings are not a closed system, they “open up” onto something greater than themselves (even if they neither understand nor obtain it). To destroy those greater things (Wild Nature), one fails in one’s vocation, namely, to be open to the universe, to be merely another force within it and to act like it. This attitude seeks to make everything sterile and artificial because those things are “safe”.

To posit “amorality” is to seek to destroy all obstacles as you go. It is to posit the individual over society, chaos over order. It is to posit that sins of omission (not doing anything) are no less grave than sins of commission (doing something). That civilized peace is built on the pile of bleached bones of extinct savages. That you can’t buy off the universe with good behavior. That you refuse the bargain of the Golden Rule because only slavery and vice come from it (and not the commendable kind). “Amorality” acknowledges that we all have “blood on our hands” because we have all bathed in this blood. Our society was irrigated by it.

Does this destroy love and mercy whole-cloth then? Not necessarily, but it certainly opposes their codification: their enshrining into the realm of rights and “inherent dignity” of the person ipso facto. I can hope for mercy for those I love, and wish for destruction on those I don’t: wishing neither makes me noble nor makes it so. I am not God: my Word is not in the beginning, and nothing is made by it. But it is perfectly reasonable for me to hate a system that would set my or any other desire as a universal code of morality. Hypocrisy? What does it matter?

Weak words about the human reasoning



I walk absorbed under a dark star-filled sky. To find something beautiful that has been kept hidden inside of me for a long time.

My feet embrace the earth and I lose myself in it. Little by little, getting into the unknown, I arrive to what used to be a forest to me, although the image of what it means to be a forest doesn't exist for me anymore, because I decided to forget it. I advance while I feel the crackling of the branches broken because of my footsteps, and I ask to myself, what are the branches?

I know that they are looking for me, but I have gone a long time ago. There is only the memory of what I once was, but the past is dead. I forget my thoughts and I appear in a magic clearing within that gorgeous place, non-human sounds explode around me, a thick mist re-cover the place where I exist, erasing my image forever.

My words almost fade when I was writing the preceding paragraphs. Because, being such an immensely overwhelming issue, as it is the human reason issue, the words show up as a very miserable thing.

It comes to my mind that the main cause because of our detractors are still trying unsuccessfully to understand what eco-extremism is about and what we are searching, is because they are still thinking in eco-extremism as a political essentially thing.

It is understandable, because eco-extremism descends from political ideologies, and it still keeps somehow a similar esthetic with all of that. It is understandable too that those who study this "phenomenon" get surprised and can't understand that people with complicated views and "rational" reflections on the world around them, are executing attacks and annihilating human lives. Here everything converge in a single unified center, born from the icredibly unreliable human mind in all its confusion.

We know that eco-extremism emerges from a brief and weak mentality, and at some point its essence attempts against itself. The eco-extremist reasons about the emergency of reject the reason, talks about the harmfulness of the language, and attempts against his own species and against the artificial and technological empire that gave him life.

The eco-extremism of the eco-extremist takes him to conceive the eco-extremism itself as a immense contradiction, like the final collision between the essences that we see, which converge in the limit of our own understanding. We walk over that limit, we play with it, and we trace our history with boundless jumps of passion and crazyness. That mysterious limit, appears to us like the occult or the unknown, all of those nature processes that surround us and we can't understand, or ultimately that we don't have interest in conceive them in the way we were taught.

Speaking for me in particular, I stopped taking valid the opinion of the science about any matter some time ago. For example, I have never seen what happens beyond the stars and therefore I have decided to don't speak about that. To talk about other planets, other galaxies, black holes or antimatter is absurd for me, it is not what I see when I rise my sight to the sky and therefore I don't take it as valid. The same with all the phenomenons that occur in my daily life, and whom I reject to interpret by the instilled scientific logic. So what I see when I raise my look to the sky, I decode it in an unavoidable way as the unknown.

As in the same way, my inner ears became deaf to the scientific explanations of the modern humans, in relation to the beautiful disasters that constantly eclipse their routine existences. When a tsunami indiscriminately hits some town, I see the wild letting fall some of its vengeance against the extraneous. I see a being (the wave), a brief and ferocious manifestation of wild nature, appearing surprisingly, hitting with an immense strength and giving all of its power, remaining then empty and disappearing again in the immensity.

It is not difficult to understand then the empathy that exists between the eco-extremists and the mentioned natural disasters. When we execute our acts, we put our lives and entrust them momentarily to a superior force that govern us. Before of every attack, we leave with the certainty that it is possible that we may not return, but assuming with calm and serenity that "the die is cast", that it will happen what it has to happen, and that "if death comes, we will continue destroying the hell".

There are few but beautiful, the moments in which I am able to separate myself from the worldly level to put my own existence in perspective, at those moments I realize of the insignificant that a simple expression of defective "life" is for the everything. An experience whose end shouldn't be feared, but embraced with plenitude. Those are the moments when my being is given the possibility to express itself in its entirety, to get on in the attack without thinking in the consequences, to convert itself in a wild animal without hesitation.

I had thought to elaborate on in this writing, tackling the very complex issue of the human reason, but I will let that to someone else, it seems to me more practical and appropriate in this moment to reduce it to the following lines: to reject the civilized reasoning is an alternative today, for the eco-extremist in his process of re-wilding, without leaving the frontal attack with the enemy. To reject all the false truths sketched by the opinion of scientists and technologists, developing our own views, learned in direct contact with the wild nature in solitude or with relateds, learning to conceive the universe from our animal being, abandoning the typical perspectives of the hyper-civilized modern human. Seeing ourselves as one more force within the immensity of a combination of forces acting in a mysterious and incomprehensible way. Being human animals in the today, waging or own suicidal war against the extraneous that tries to domesticate us, rejecting the obligation to be focused in paradigms that force us to ask "why?", trying in this way to annihilate the immensity of the unknown phenomenons, by limiting them and confining them inside of the deformed and defective human cognizable concepts.

And now I leave to prepare the next attack, to be ready when the next instant in which I cease of being a civilized human arrive, even if it is just for a moment, to feel how the forces of the unknown act through me, and guide my vibrating hands in the moment of the laying of the explosive, or the beginning of the fire. How they light up my path that take me to my objective, and then they cover my escape steps under the mantle of the occult, as has happened the previous times.

I go to the next moment that I will experiment far away from their disgusting cities, far away from the bright of this machine that harm my eyes in the moment I write this words, returning to what I once was, giving life to a mystery that exists located within some remote part of my being, which I found accidentally for the first time, when I found myself walking absorbed under a dark star-filled sky.

– **Huazihul**

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ACTS OF THE MODERN HUMAN FROM AN ECO-EXTREMIST PERSPECTIVE

Short introduction: this text began to be written at the beginning of february and it was thought to be published before, but because of one and another issue its wording had a slight delay, even so, we saw the opportunity that it were published in Regresión Magazine #7. At the beginning of the text it can be read that some events occurred in Mexico, and a few more specifically in the region of Lagunera (EN1), which the reader can investigate if he wants for having a better understanding. The matter exposed in the text is more complex and we know that it needs to be more developed, but it is what there is at the moment, at least we achieved through this writing made by four hands and in insomnia nights, to order some ideas in our heads that were so messy.

From the earthquake of the crisis:

Citizenship still lamenting the increase of the price of gasoline, in the region of Lagunera “leftist organizations” that doesn’t exceed twenty members, get excited and thrilled with the “awaking of the people”, another illusion, another revolution that will never come. A few hours before Andrés Manuel López Obrador (EN2), the loved leader of lots of leftists -that cause me too much laughter-, show up in Torreón; talking on hope, on the future change when he and his party get the power.

We feel so distant from those people of “noble heart”, who will cry of emotion with the hopeful words of their leader, or from those who crave another social discontent situation for demonstrate and feel closer to their dreamed revolution. For them our total contempt and derisive laughter.

Recent events have shaken Mexico from looting at different points of the country (EN3), a shooting in a school of Monterrey (EN4), to the suicide attempt of a student from Torreón (EN5), all of that have shaken citizenship and have outraged and worried the leftists of noble heart. We don’t feel empathy with any of those “tragic” events, since we enjoy seeing that everything within civilization is descomposing, after all, the progress that they promise and sell to us isn’t that ideal and beautiful.

Today the wild wind made us imagine Cachiripa (EN6) manifesting in front of the fierce irritilas, although it was a strong wind that embraced us with melancholy; we know, that will never come back. The human, turning into fully dependent of technology lost all his naturalness, becoming artificial and accepting that condition with joy and excitement, hyper-civilized humans move excited towards the ideal technological future. Today the wind that lashed the city was just infected with industrial waste that poison the air, the wind just stunk of progress and insatiable urbanism. A regression is impossible, we don’t seek that the human being returns to the stone age, since that would make us another naives, for us humans deserve to disappear.

This is what motivate us to write today, since, we don’t know if people outside eco-extremism haven’t got capacity to make an analytical reading or if eco-extremists are really awful writers, because it seems that there is something that generates a lot of conflict to all of those pseudo-critics who “study” and “explain” the acts and communiques that we make. It is very recurrent see or hear those “critics” making the question of: And what are this inane people seeking?, or other times make their fanciful explanations about what do eco-terrorists want, without forgetting the most recurrent mistake: to brand us of anarchists even though in almost every communiqué that makes any group is emphasized that eco-extremists/terrorists AREN’T anarchists.

Some anarchists still looking for a radical change in the way of human relations, turn hierarchy ways into horizontal ways where no one would be above anyone, we the eco-extremists don’t seek a change in human relations, the human is despicable to us, we don’t care if the worker is exploited or the public transport increase its price, this is something that pseudo-intellectuals can’t structure when they talk on eco-extremism, that our war isn’t for the human, but all the opposite, we are the antithesis of the human. That’s why we keep ourselves external and repudiate all struggle and ideology that seek to contribute positively to the humanity, in other words; eco-extremism is against human progress and everything that it entails despite the contradiction that represents our condition.

We are not good-hearted beings; we even reject the concept of being “good”, why?; because, long ago, we stopped finding “reasons” to fight for the development and well-being of humanity. As we wrote before, some analysts try to decipher the thought of the eco-extremists, without being able to quit that anthropocentric viewpoint when postulating their conjectures about eco-extremism. With this we mean that they always try to seek a human sense of the actions of the tendency. In other words, when some eco-extremist group attempts, the questioning revolve around, what do this groups demand?, and even in an horrific wrong way it has been said in some news that the eco-extremist attempts seek to “demand” the liberation of prisoners linked with the anarchist movement. Media still lying and reveal their ignorance every time that talk about us. Neither “official” nor “alternative” are exempt from this repetitive error.

But, what can be expected from those “great sages” and intellectuals?, what can be expected when someone who lives to achieve goals find some that don’t expect anything with their actions, nor a triumph because they know it is all lost? That shout of “nothing is lost”, stopped having any meaning in our view. Effectively, it is all lost, but for the intellectuals that talk and talk on us and our actions, those who carry the humanistic, moralist and anthropocentric (AN1) feelings so characteristic of the western worldview, everything run an ideal course or at least they don’t stop viewing it in that sense towards the full human development, using such concept without even question its implications.

As we saw, the word freedom takes part in that humanistic thought, but, what does it mean to declare itself free? To declare itself “free” today is synonymous with being able to finance consumption choices in the supply market, choosing the best place to get drunk after a mitigating work week, traveling to the destinations with the greatest tourist attraction, forming or not a family and myriad of things that have place in the free will of the civilized being. As we see the free being is indisputably linked with commerce, consumption and mercantile life. Will the civilized human be really free? The human, when born is the mammal that takes longer to fend for itself unlike the other non-human animals, it comes to this world defenceless and requires years of learning in the middle of a family to be autonomous; that aspect of the human life isn’t capricious, since thousands and even millions of years ago appropriating the survival techniques required an ample development of wisdoms. In ancient times, the tribe taught the younger the basic and elemental knowledge for their survival, so that they had the capacity and aptitude to face such an hostile natural environments. Now, that long-lasting characteristics in the infant’s growth remain, only they are used in a different way, there is a first period of raising within a family, which is responsible for indoctrinate the young human *ad hoc* to the way of life that the modern techno-industrial society presents and accepts.

In this text we have decided to focus on an aspect that family, school, society and diverse media are responsible for build in our thought when we begin to have consciousness on our own existence. Maybe with this we will be able to give an explanation of why the ridiculous analysts we will never understand the thought of the eco-extremists. Since they as every inhabitant of modern society, were also educated in the schemes imposed by the techno-industry. The contexts in which different people interact and develop themselves within this modern society are varied and extremely different, at least in Mexico that difference is very noticeable, it is enough to analyze distinct aspects to arrive to this conclusion, the residential zones denote purchasing power because of their location, what influences the type of institutions where people is educated and the places where people develop themselves; aspirations are another polymorphic aspect in civilization that we will address later, the differences in the relationships are determined by the context too and we see it reflected in language, since despite we talk spanish in the country, we can find regional variants, we can even find contrasts between sectors in a single city, this because experience and language give the way to interpret and see the world to the speakers, it is then the basis of thought (AN2). But, in respect of aspirations, although different, is something that the inhabitants of the different contexts share, in other words, each inhabitant of the modern society have an aspiration, an objective that has to be achieved, for what? For a banal realization, to achieve success, what we will explain.

Since childhood, they educate us to be “prominent” in something, we get implanted the idea of excel in this mercantile world, everyone want to be “outstanding”, although there are diverse concepts and ways about this, one more time it all depends on the context in which you desire to stand out, although the price when the goal isn’t achieved is the same: frustration. The mind of the modern human revolves around achieving objectives even if they are superficial, family as we wrote above indoctrinates us, prepares us within civilization to set objectives to us, although firstly they are diffuse, when we have gained the social standards of behavior, school and society come to help polish those desires and goals that begin to take shape and clarify increasingly. Diverse media give the final thrust, since cybernetic media -to which even the younger have already access- lately offer the schemes to which our goals and aspirations have to adjust, but... How to achieve it? It doesn’t matter, the point is to place yourself in the top, or to deceive yourself pretending it.

The goals of each human aren’t innate, they aren’t substantial, human doesn’t have those desires before birth, they are determined by his context, therefore, the goals will not be the same for someone from a marginal neighborhood, and for someone from a luxurious and wealthy sector. What is shared in this modern society is the desire to obtain the recognition that is caused by achieving some goal. Modern humans act to be well-known by their social environment, from the most superficial being to the most leftist revolutionary, wanting to be recognized, being commended and acclaimed for having achieved the goal is a part of the functioning of the human, or better of the hyper-civilized who inhabits within modern techno-industrial society.

There are some whose dreamy and yearned goal is to mount a company, and it isn’t surprising since the story of the young entrepreneur and the business life is a canon promoted by media within modern society, it is enough to observe the type of education that is imparted in most private schools, a clear example of them is the ITESM (Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education), an institution that fosters business life and impulses its students to become those “young entrepreneur” committed with mercantile and human progress. But all modern humans DON’T intend to mount their own company, there are other that expect to end their university studies and thus be able to “be someone in life”, throwing then themselves into paid and bored work ensalving themselves in a company, but always with the goal of being able to earn an important pile of money. It isn’t new to listen someone who says that he is going to study certain university degree because according to him, “there is the money”.

But in the pretentious desire of achieving his goals -which sometimes are called life goals-, there is something more than the accumulation of money, since there are some people whose “life goals” -like they say- are based on getting drunk, going out to party and being the most popular of all. You will ask, “do they have any purpose?”, because they are almost always in jobs that allow them to pay their vice or they often doesn’t work, a lot of people will say – then they are breaking with the rules imposed by modern society, they are the living contradiction of life based on achieving goals. It is even funny that there are people who believe that they are the living “antithesis” of the values dictated by modern society because they live their lives according to the use of (legal or illegal) drugs. Unfortunately for those subjects who feel like “social pariah” or great rebels, their consumption and fun are another acts imposed by modern society.

The capital accumulation, the economic well-being, finishin the university, drinking and going out to nightclubs are indeed the achieved goals, but, the true satisfaction behind the “great” goal is the *social recognition*. We have to keep and eye on the fact that each goal is determined by a social context, that is, it is arisen from social cohabitation, therefore, it is a social product. Thus, techno-industrial modern society which is present even in the slightest action of its inhabitants, is the great determinant of the goals that every hyper-civilized want to achieve. Better said, the relations that are conditioned by modern society.

But the recognition for every goal isn’t similar in all the contexts, the goals that have to be achieved in a rich family are different from the goals that have to be achieved in a gang, or in a party group of friends. It is for this reason, that the transcendence of the objectives depends on the social context in which lives and coexists the human who gets ready to achieve them, the given social recognition depends, therefore, on the social context. What is shameful in a social context, in other one is motive to praise.

It is here where all analysis and reasoning of the “intellectual experts” find a maze in which there are infinite exits, when they try to explain the discourse and the acts of the eco-extremists. What can be expected when those who live based on achieving goals motivated by the social recognition that they will obtain, find some people that aren’t interested in getting any type of social recognition? Because eco-extremists don’t hope compliments, nor be admired, nor be recognized by civilization, to the contrary, we just hope contempt from civilization and its blind perpetrators. This is why “analysts” don’t find motives guided by their goddess “reason”, because the most reasonable thing is to have a purpose, an objective that has to be achieved, their schemes are destroyed when they realize that there are people who don’t base their lives on achieving goals, since eco-extremists don’t hope to accomplish anything transcendental in our acting, neither we deceive ourselves thinking that our purpose or better said, our objective, is to defeat civilization, we know that it isn’t possible. No more wishes!, we shout to the naive dreamers. No more dreams!, we shout to those who just doze in their ephemeral existence. No more tomorrows!, we shout like a thunder to those who fear the present.

There will be a lot of criticisms towards this text, we advance one, they will tell us: why eco-extremists spread communiques and reflections if they don’t seek to achieve any goal, nor get the transcendental? Eco-extremists are in a war, therefore, the propaganda and the reflection are tools which we use when we position ourselves within this debacle, tactics like “war of nerves” (AN3) are used by eco-extremists, from the sharp critique to the shocking explosive.

They carry on being in their world of wishes and dreams, we will continue dancing in hells!

-Ozomatli

-Huehucoyotl

Torreón, marzo 2017

Editor’s notes (EN)

1) The region of Lagunera comprises various municipalities of the states of Coahuila and Durango, to mention the main ones there are the municipalities of Lerdo and Gómez Palacio in Durango, and Torreón in Coahuila. In the past, the mentioned zone shared rivers, mountains, oasis, deserts and a great variety of ecosystems where wandered the wild Irritilas (among other ones), natives hunters-gatherer-fishers nomads who were decimated by the diseases, migration and war of the european invaders in the XVI century.

2) Possible leftist presidential candidate, who says that he will govern Mexico with “love”.

3) Looting in commercial stores, pawnshops, gas stations, department stores and more business, was provoked in January of 2017 in cities like Estado de Mexico, Ciudad de Mexico, Veracruz, Nuevo León, Cancún, Michoacán, Chiapas, Puebla,

etc. On the event, various groups of ITS in the center of the country claimed their participation in those looting in the 19th communique of the Mafia.

4) The 18 of January, a teenager coldly shot a Cal.22 against students and his teacher at Northeastern American College, in the city of Monterrey, Nuevo León. The case was widely disseminated by national and international press, in the link the video of the massacre and some images of the event:

<http://www.bestgore.com/road-accidents/teen-student-shoot-teacher-colegio-americano-del-noreste-mexico/>

5) The 20 of January of this year a teenager tried to suicide inside of a high school in the city of Torreón, Coahuila. Although, according to press, the teenager had thought to kill various students and then suicide as it occurred in Monterrey, it doesn't occurred in this way and it only was registered his suicidal attempt. Here the note of the press:

<https://www.debate.com.mx/mexico/Joven-intenta-suicidarse-en-su-preparatoria-20170120-0135.html>

7) Cachiripa, according to what it was said in the fifteenth communique of ITS in a brief final note, was an animist manifestation of the Irritilas, closely related with wind and soil eddies that appear in the region.

<http://maldicionecoextremista.altervista.org/america-decimo-quinto-comunicado-de-individualistas-tendiendo-lo-salvaje/>

Author's notes (AN)

1) This three concepts are extremely complex and complicated, it is even more complicated to try to fully explain them in this text whose goal isn't that, it will be in other occasion. So to avoid the misunderstandings we will develop the concepts trying to make it easy to understand. On humanism we will put as key point the human rights and the motto of the French Revolution "Freedom, Equality and Fraternity" because we think that this three "human rights" still prevailing in the thought of every western being, it would be interesting to question what is understood by that motto. On the moralist concept we contemplate it as one of the ways the inhabitants of civilization think and act, since we see that most of their acts and thoughts are ruled by moral, dividing everything in good and bad and judging from that optics. In respect of anthropocentrism which is reinforced by the previous concepts we see the tendency in which everything revolve around of the human being and its interests which tend to its progress without keep in mind the implications and consequences of its acts.

2) Sapir-Whorf hypothesis refers to the linguistic relativism that in a very reductionist way talks on how determinant a language can be in the way of thinking of a society.

3) For now we will not go deeper in the concept of "war of nerves", because is something very complex that deserves a separate writing to achieve a better develop.

Why should I love you? Brief night reflections on love

"As for me, I have never understood how two beings that love each other and believe to have found supreme happiness in love do not prefer to break violently with all social conventions and suffer all types of humiliations before they depart from life, renouncing for one adventure since one cannot imagine that there are others."

Schopenhauer said this perhaps on a fearful night like this one; one in which I think about the act of love and how it relates to modern society.

In the first place, for some time I have been writing a text on the discourse promoted by the mass media and how they determine the daily life of the modern human. The text isn't finished, and in truth there is not enough time to complete it at the moment, and to finalize it and bring it to light. Nevertheless, that does not stop me from pausing on this April night to write a bit on love. But, what does the above text have to do with this topic? For me, the relationship is in how love as it is understood in modern times has been formed by discourse that newly molds and determines human action.

Thus as the old Schopenhauer was not able to understand the happiness that two beings found in loving each other, I many decades later cannot understand how the human can find happiness in loving his neighbor. This when the subject that is referred to as the neighbor can be so distant and unknown. This is perfectly embodied in the phrase, 'love for the people' that is frequently intoned by good-hearted leftists.

'Love the people' what is the people and why should I love it? That's what I ask myself since in these modern times love of one's neighbor has become a two-edged sword. Maybe saying it just has two edges is an understatement. Where am I going with this? That the modern human in his daily life is bombarded, either subtly or not-so-subtly, with diatribes on how he should love his neighbor, that child of God who is equal to him. That his neighbor deserves love, tolerance, respect, and understanding. Why is he my neighbor? Why should I feel some affinity to my neighbor if we have distinct interests? This is where I ask myself: Why should I love you? Why should I love my neighbor, if I feel no bond to him?

I recall here that which concerns Schopenhauer and me, which is: How does one achieve happiness through loving another being? I recognize that the goal of love is not totally the same in Schopenhauer's and my conception. For me, love of one's neighbor, besides being a multi-edged sword, also possesses many interests and ends. Which are these?

The answers at the heart of the question are numerous and are determined by the interest of the subject who is reflecting on the theme. For me and my interests this is a motive for the modern human loves his neighbor, and not only that, but to seek the diverse social contexts in which this love can develop. In essence, the interest in loving one's neighbor and to show it is found in the quest for social recognition that is proper to the modern human. (b)

It is for this reason that the neighbor becomes in an objective, since the modern human pursues social recognition to show his love for that being named 'neighbor,' even though it is essence unknown to him. Acts of altruism which issue forth from various media, principally digital ones, make so that humans feel empathy and a bond to those who realize the altruistic act, even if they are charitable acts toward animals. They even end up feeling empathy to what they have come to understand as 'nature.'

This apparently innocent, loving, and charitable sentimentalism toward persons, animals, and plants is nothing more than a fallacy. It is a lie through which modern humans act in an insatiable search for social recognition; a desire and quest that in most instances is invisible to the hyper-civilized. The act by which a good-hearted subject feeds a homeless person with a pizza, or gives a dying puppy something to drink, or gives water to a plant about to dry out, signifies nothing; it changes nothing, the world will continue on its course toward the precipice, a course that is guided and impelled by humans. Why does the modern human do it then? They excuse themselves saying that this action changes the world of the person acted upon, which for me is dumb and false.

Whoever receives the noble action, or better said, the 'loving' action continues to inhabit a social context. Thus the homeless person keeps living within the society that lacks employment possibilities, the puppy and the plant continue to find themselves in a poisoned world where sooner or later human activity will destroy them. The act of love excused in empathy and altruism is the most false act that one can commit.

Their loving altruism is dripping in the search for social recognition, even if they deny it. The desire to achieve social recognition is even hidden from human consciousness at times. As I wrote at the beginning, human life is controlled: he who thinks himself free is blind! The discourse that takes form through publicity plays a very important role in the control of the hyper-civilized each time he kneels to it, always in an imperceptible manner.

I will stop here for now. I know that this text isnt more than a brief introduction to a theme with many facets such as love. This is always controversial, and I hope that these texts that I have drafted will relate to each other and will be of interest to the tendency in general. I have aimed to write a brief but clear treatment of one aspect of the many potential formulations concerning love from my perspective as an eco-extremist.

-Huehuecoyotl-
Torreón, April 2017

Notes:

- (a) See Arthur Schopenhauer. Love, in Love, Women, and Death.*
- (b) For a better reference on this topic see the work that I wrote with Ozomatli for Revista Regresión: Huehuecoyotl, & Ozomatli. (2017, abril 4). Algunas reflexiones sobre el actuar del humano moderno desde una perspectiva eco-extremista. 'Regresión. Cuadernos contra el progreso tecnoindustrial, Number 7.*

Autexousious Apanthropinization

"If you go to the borders, you might see trees, soil, sea, but you will not see countries. When I roam in solitude inside the city I see heaps of human creations, all manifestations of God, but I don't see any Gods anywhere."

This is only a short text, which mentions realizations that I have wanted for a while now to write about. I myself have escaped the masochism hidden behind these same realizations, and these words are written to refute erroneous conclusions that had been expressed, and criticisms that I don't agree with anymore, regarding ecoextremism, which was approached from a point of view of values, obscuring what it is objectively. The words written here are coming out of lived personal experiences.

"It seems to me that society usually wins. There are, to be sure, free spirits in the world, but their freedom, in the last analysis, is not much greater than that of a canary in a cage. They may leap from perch to perch; they may bathe and guzzle at their will; they may flap their wings and sing. But they are still in the cage, and sooner or later it conquers them."

-H.L. Mecken-

The freedom that the spiritual man seeks, the freedom of values, the freedom of liberation is an illusion that gets crushed under the guillotine of the objective observation of human nature. It is murk that becomes mire when it comes in contact with reality.

Some believe that Christianity limited the human spirit. What they don't understand is that Christianity is the human spirit. The ethical self that denies natural existence. Mind over matter. All that modernity has done is to recycle its name. The purpose remained the same.

Let's take one thing out of the way and say, that what has come to be termed as Anarchy has nothing to do with Nihilism. I am not playing with words here, I will be blunt. It is the objective realization of facts outside of bullshit subjectivistic valuatative thought that gives a context for reality. Anarchist realities and interpretation are always based on social contexts, like this could be considered the default structure that can't be dissected furthermore. It is always based on the ethical world of humans. It is always mind over matter. The mind is the boss of the ego and the ego follows. Though egoism is a reality that cannot be disproved. Anarchist logic is always formulated according to root ideological constructions. The natural ego remains unable to fully take over. The ego, all impulses and irrational desires don't need justification from ideas to exist or to do jack shit. Antisocial Nihilism is essentially misanthropic and removes out of the way once and for all, the artificial world of the human mind. In other words you can either use your brain as simple, harsh and indifferent logic exactly as the naturalness of nothingness around you does and use it only as a weapon whenever it is applicable, or otherwise it is as useless and a fabrication of myths, as is the entire human world that has been built through it. The human spirit doesn't exist! Looking even more deeply, the paradoxical nature of consciousness and phenomenology is not something that can be overlooked.

"Attempting to think the thing without being given in advance the means of attaining it: that is the task of phenomenology. An impossible task, the temptation of the impossible. But is this not our human condition?"

-Marc Richir-

Outlined truly in the above sentences, this is all there is to it! All the masochism of human existence is here, all the self torture that seems so difficult to get rid of. Think that with this pathetic tool, the mind, the humanly constructed realities are created. Think where they step on and how crumbling they are when contrasted with the natural sharp gaze of Nihilism.

"Here the feelings of misanthropism come to be attached, and as limitative as they might seem on a social-cultural scale which doesn't concern me at all, as much liberating they are on a scale of existential search. The realization of triviality of existence if perceived as a value in itself and therefore the human substance inside it makes you loathe with the anthropocentric way of thinking and being and their exaltation of the human as a moral value or the centre of evolution. It's these moments that you see the human thinking it can reach with a purpose a long term target, whichever their purpose might be, as a thinking and rational being it thinks that it can create, change, adjust the world to fit it, adjust the lives of the non-human animals to fit the world and to fit it. Moments of pure arrogance and ignorance. Moments of ideology. "Humanity" for me as a concept parasitizes in the mind and as entities parasitize with the mass way of living. "

-Archegonos-

The so called human is just an animal that always wants to forget it is such. And it is not a "bad" animal. Just a totally dysfunctional one. A cursed biological organism. Because when the human arises (the world of mind and thought) it tells it that there is something beyond that. Hence the need for ethical considerations to determine why are we "bad". What went wrong? Nothing that the world of mind can't fix of course! It doesn't matter that Nihilism when taken to its logical conclusion eradicates

all the humanly constructed reality and you remain with what is left to act upon, but some peoples connection with the shit that is inside their heads still makes them try for the impossible. They want to fool themselves. All this bullshit has become part of the human DNA.

So if an anarchist is frank with himself should admit that he seeks to re-create right and wrong. That he wants to perpetuate the human and its bonds that have become biological realities after so many years of flagellation and self defeat. There are three types of anarchists that I can recognize right now. The honest (but failing) idealist, the priest and the fool. All of them remain moralists. What I was, was a much more differentiated kind but it had a paradoxical nature. For the anarchists the world doesn't have enough spirit. They want to instill more into it. What kind of spirit will that be is not what matters here. What matters is the insistence on maintaining faith in the human being. Though if you advocate Nihilism and not ideological hypnosis you will be as healthy as possible. You won't have the fuckin insistence on masturbating with the human anymore. Antisocial Nihilism doesn't have any concerns about justifying any behavior against anyone whereas Anarchy has to answer to ideas.

I for one accept that I am an obscene and depraved product of today's civilization and of the total misanthropy, which has shaken off all idealism, that the abomination of the societies of the ethical being, of this pet, has imposed upon me. I hate everyone the same no matter who or what they are. For me it is not a matter of who "deserves" to die. It is not an ethical question. I don't need justification from something. I desire whomever to die in this stenchy christophany which is the civilized human world and its artificial carnivals. I don't see spirits around me. I see parasites limiting my claim of power. My claim of power which can't be much with so many parasites around me, this doesn't mean that this harsh truth bends my will. I have specific interest in the spread of misanthropic action in the extramoral sense. I still though have the capacity for respect, which actually surprises me, but it is exactly the way it is realized and felt that makes it an aspect of power and not of christianism. So not in a sense of an ethically rooted idea of equality, but in a spontaneous violent affinity of an animalistic frank action-reaction of beast towards beast. For some animals that we have shared egoistically, not communally, with an attitude of in your face aggression. Some win, some lose, but they all learn something out of it. If something doesn't destroy you, it will most probably make you stronger. Outside of shame and the hypocritical veil of christianism or the elitism of the spiritual priesthood of the righteous ones.

For the anarchists whatever they do is fundamentally rooted in the western mentality, part of the ecclesiastical political cultures, part of the normal way of life, in a sense of the human conduct, the participation in the Theatre. It remains and will always remain humanist. For me whatever I do in this sanctified purulent sink of citizenry is an act of egocentric arbitrariness. Pure negation. A step into the paths of the void. The opening of the gate is a non path to war, a chance to satisfy my thirst, a spit in the face of ethico-biological barriers. It isn't a fantasy of any form of liberation. It isn't a scheme of the "good". Whoever stares at this world and not the world of heaven will know what I mean. Total Nihil is my shadow it isn't my enemy.

Why do I even bother to write since I hate everyone? Since I even abhor the world of the internet which I use and its ways of communication? I am seeking to fulminate my course of the fall in the paltripolitan panopticon, which will be death, capture or cowardice. There are no other ways or solutions. The liberation of the raped corpse of Christ will not save me. And to shut the word holes of all those who have hated me for who I am, because they see in me a depravity, and when I opened my mouth I spat poison on their frith of mind. And as I said before, to spread misanthropic action after some rejected fallacies.

The basic notions that have been rejected and henceforth my misanthropic Nihilism attempts the expansion of my ego over are these: The arrival of every new human being over the arbitrariness of chaos. The notion of anarchy vs authority. The notion of the individual vs domination. The spiritual ego. Every idea over my unique concrete ego. Every ethical consideration. The biological superiority of human existence.

What I say in this text is a vomit that will benefit only me from spitting it out. It is no obligation towards anyone, neither attempt for criticism, nor a pillar towards collective evolution. I don't give two fucks about this, I only care now to support and sharpen my complicities with the crazy motherfucker Nihilists who attack everything because our interests overlap, outside of ideological, political utopian collective quests. Everyone pursues their own, we agree on indiscriminate attack and I will not claim to be able to say more for now. All total misanthropes, the eco-extremists, nihilist terrorists and other nihilist criminals who have understood that human existence and its theatrical performances are a joke. Those who don't deny their natural ego and accept authority as a natural reality. I am also one of those who defy the biological/ethical limits that have been programmed into us by modernity. I am the solitary misanthrope patient each time for the right moment to eviscerate more and more another piece of humanity. Everyone else can continue trying to resuscitate the human from its tombs.

I talk with the pet animals in the zoo,
the one they named the human world,
I dissect their thoughts, their dreams,
their faithful aspirations, their subjectivistic spirituality,

aspects of what is called human,
the ultimate lie and pillar of ethics,
the cornerstone of the human world.
In the zoo the animals
have been talked into believing
they are humans
and some of them
even think they are more than that.
That they are spirits of another world.
The human has flagellated them,
so hard that they have repent.
So let the biological clocks of ethics correct us!
Natural existence is despised so much
that the mind has taken over.
The ego has mutated into a mass
of ideological deprivation,
that consumes the organism.
I laugh cataclysmically with their piety,
and their unconscious hypocrisy.
"Recycle the spirit my brothers!
Never let it die, for if it dies,
we are doomed into chaos!
To be consumed by nature.
So let us be raped by Christ!
Let the spirit cum all over us!"

Archegonos





ANTI-HUMANIST EDITIONS
TAGUATUHÚ